

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI,
HATTIESBURG DIVISION

WILLIAM ELWOOD

PLAINTIFF

VERSUS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:06cv91-DCB-RHW

COBRA COLLECTION AGENCY

DEFENDANT

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [**docket entry no. 55**]. Having carefully considered the Motion, applicable statutory and case law, and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, the Court finds and orders as follows:

On January 3, 2008, the Court entered an Opinion and Order [docket entry no. 53] in which it granted the defendant's Motion to Strike Amended Complaint [docket entry no. 49]. A Final Judgment [docket entry no. 54] was issued on the same date, there being no claims for relief remaining in the case. On January 4, 2008, the plaintiff filed his Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's Opinion and Order and Final Judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 59(e).

"Rule 59(e) 'serves the narrow purpose of allowing a party to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.' Reconsideration of a judgment after its entry is an extraordinary remedy that should be used sparingly." Templet v. HydroChem, Inc., 367 F. 3d 473, 479 (5th Cir.

2004) (internal citations omitted). The Court is of the opinion that the plaintiff has neither produced any new evidence nor brought any egregious errors of law or fact to the Court's attention in the Motion sub judice. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [**docket entry no. 55**] is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this the 19th day of February 2008.

s/ David Bramlette
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE